R E P O R T R E S U M E S

ED 013 796 SP 001 311

PLANNING FOR THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS.

BY- HASKEW, LAURENCE D.

PUB DATE 1 DEC 65

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.25 HC-$0.68 17P.

DESCRIPTORS- CONTINUING EDUCATION, *EDUCATIONAL NEEDS, *EDUCATIONAL PLANNING, *EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES, EDUCATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY, LOCAL ISSUES, *TEACHER EDUCATION, *TEACHER EVALUATION, TEACHING PROCEDURES,

A PLATFORM FOR PLANNING IN TEACHER EDUCATION IS SET FORTH--(1) PLANNING BEGINS IN A FRAMEWORK (AS IT IS RATHER THAN WHAT IT MIGHT BE). (2) PLANNING SHOULD ADDRESS FUNDAMENTAL DEFECTS, SHOWING HOW WHAT WE PURPORT TO DO CAN BE DONE WITH THE TOOLS AND FRAMEWORK WE CAN MAKE AVAILABLE. (3) PLANNING SHOULD INSPIRE THE TEACHER TO WANT AND ACQUIRE THE CONTINUING EDUCATION HE WILL NEED (THROUGH GRADUATE STUDY, OTHER FORMS OF PARTICIPATION, ON HIS OWN INITIATIVE) SINCE THE NATURE OF TEACHING IS CONTINUALLY CHANGING. (4) IT IS THE INDIVIDUAL PROFESSIONAL WHO MUST DO THE PLANNING, AND IN THE NEXT DECADE PLANNING WILL BE FOCUSED AT THE LOCAL LEVEL. (5) PLANNING MUST BE CONCERNED WITH VARIETY. PAPER READ AT GOVERNOR'S CONFERENCE ON EDUCATION (STATE OF UTAH, DECEMBER 1, 1965). (AF)

SP 01311

SP01311

Haskew, Laurence D.
(U. of Texas)

OCT 31 1967

ED013796

PLANNING FOR THE EDUCATION OF TEACHERS

Our first premise is that the education of teachers should be planned for. Note the assumptions underlying this premise. Education for teachers should have some significant characteristics which render it distinctive and identifiable within generic education. Such education is for teachers; that is, it is intended to interest students, equip them for teaching, present them to the profession of teaching, and assist them in becoming and remaining after employment effective practitioners in that profession. This type of education -- necessarily addressed to tremendous numbers of people and conducted by multitudinous, largely autonomous, agencies -- is not likely to transpire in sufficient volume either fortuitously or as the result of competition in an open market. And, finally, the existing designs and patterns for the education of teachers hardly merit institutionalization as the agents of evolution; further telesis -- in other words, intelligent planning, is essential lest we stop when we should just be starting.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

The second premise is that education for teachers is an extremely difficult undertaking if our criterion is the performance exhibited by the teacher who goes about his professional duties. The adoption of this criterion distinguishes professional education -- in law, in engineering, in scientific research, in teaching -- as an identifiable venture in pragmatic intellectual endeavor, focusing it upon the performance of a person. The resources to be focused are multitudinous, kaleidoscopic. The context in which the person functions is equally evanescent, so dynamic at times as to appear to be an amorphous avalanche. The person himself -- impressively a creature of all he has met and does meet -- refuses to stay put as a working definition of a student. And, his influence grows apace, becoming more and more crucial in determining what this world shall become. The Coggeshall Report on medical education declares, "The important question for the future is whether the present system (of medical education) is sufficiently flexible and imaginative to keep pace with the contemporary revolution

in medical science and the changing expectations of the people of America."[1] To which other varieties of professional education chorus, "So say we all." Upon difficulty so great, combined reason and inquiry must be brought to bear. That is perhaps why this Governor's Conference on Education in Utah takes teacher education as one of its topics. That is certainly why my presentation to the Conference deals almost exclusively with planning for teacher education.

Planning is a word capable of holding many contents. A speaker should tell what content he has in it, and some of the content he excludes. In this speaker's vocabulary, planning is an honest and disciplined search by honest, informed minds for promising means-ends strategy. Planning does eventuate in plans, but these are only artifactual and -- let us firmly declare -- temporary comments upon a continuing process which attempts, as Coggeshall says, to keep pace. The "planning" to which I refer is not essentially a process for

---

[1] Lowell T. Coggeshall, M.D., Planning for Medical Progress Through Education. Evanston: Association of American Medical Colleges, 1965. p. 11.

achieving consensus, for establishing uniformity, nor for resolution of competing proprietary interests by political behavior. Past experience in teacher education circles with this word may arouse misleading connotations. People have seen plans, not planning; plan-makers, not planners; plan imposition, not planned inquiry; opinions sanctioned with law, not compositions sanctioned by results. The context for "planning" in teacher education almost inevitably includes the legal power of the State, dealing with such precious commodities as accreditation and licensure. Uniformities are thus sought and proclaimed, but almost always in terms of least common denominators and, hence, least significant characteristics. Because the State enters so strongly, alleged planning has often become an exercise in resolution of forces by political behavior, and what started out to be planning for teacher education produces artifacts to safeguard against abuses rather than dynamic vehicles designed to keep pace. The very language of alleged "plans" for teacher education is

debilatative; course titles, course credits and majors are words manipulated as if they had referents, inevitably extending invitation to substitute form for substance. On the individual college campus, polite or politic academic horse-trading is often carried on in the same specie, masquerading as planning for teacher education. Such superficialities, as essential as they may be in this imperfect world, are tangential to the definition of planning which, to repeat, is used herein to connote a continuous, conscious search for better ways to construct better means-ends strategy in teacher education.

Planning happens incidentally and inevitably in education for teachers. It happens much more constructively and influentially, however, when reliance is upon design in addition to happenstance. And it is much more likely to occur when there is a chance that planning <u>can</u> make a difference, not merely compose intriguing jousts with the windmills of bureaucracy. A Governor's Conference on Education may well examine what viability exists and could be made to exist

for planning -- on-purpose, vigorous, hopeful planning, that is --

in this state. In the hope this may occur, your speaker now has the temerity to suggest planks for a platform of planning.

1. Planning begins in a framework. It is not always necessary, nor wise, to discard an old skeleton to produce new muscle. Frameworks such as certification laws and tripartite curricula, are not sacrosanct, but neither are they damned. Planners can outwit almost any set of plan-makers, and it is usually most profitable to begin with what <u>is</u> in prefernece to what <u>if</u>. The Fisher Act in California, for example, is not an insuperable barrier to genuine improvement of teacher education, but a challenge to planners. At the same time, a given framework need not be allowed to place limits upon honest search by honest, informed minds for improved morphologies. Morphology can be changed. To what avail, however, is a real question. For three decades this speaker has been watching and participating in efforts to improve teacher education by changing its structural design. He emerges quite skeptical that the energy expended in producing new formalities is justified by the results achieved in affecting persons who teach.

2. This conclusion leads to the proposal of a ~~third~~ second plank in a platform for planning in 1965. Planning should address fundamental insufficiencies as its prime target. In teacher education -- as in all professional education -- these are painfully clear. No one of the elements is doing sufficiently well what it purports to do. Students with 36-semester-hour major in History emerge with pitifully weak conceptions of the discipline of history as a way for analyzing humankind's experience, still almost completely reliant upon a secondary school textbook to <u>be</u> history for their students. A college boasts of its requirement that all teacher-candidates must complete 72 hours in general education, but the boasts turn to alibis when the performance of its graduates is tested on the firing line. It is assumed that those in this audience know the evidence that quantitative additions within structural elements of a curriculum show little correlation with output, when the results due to selectivity are removed. The burning question is not how much Education a student is required to take as he goes through college, but how much professional prowess

gets through to the student as he takes Education. All of which is a way of saying that planning for teacher education can well be preoccupied for the next decade with the task of finding out <u>how</u> what we purport to do can be done with the tools and within the framework we can make available. It is <u>not</u> planning to equate the goal of being at home in philosophical thought with two required courses in Philosophy, and the earlier college instructors in philosophy discern this fallacy, the better.

3. Speaking of fallacies, this presentation may be foisting one upon the audience by ~~speaking~~ *treating* of teacher education as if it consists in what colleges do to pre-baccalaureate students before they get jobs as teachers. That certainly violates a ~~fourth~~ *third* plank in any respectable platform for planning. A reasonably detailed vision of approaching context is part of the information honest minds must bring to planning, or secure during that process. To this presenter, certain features of that context appear compelling. First, when the college graduate

of 1965 enters the profession of teaching most of his education for teaching lies in front of him, not behind. A high proportion of what he now "knows" will be obsolete in ten years, and most of what he needs to know ten years hence has not yet been produced. He enters a career of educating himself and of being educated. If his preparation in collegiate years is sound, it is perforce different from traditional readying to take over a classroom. Prime requisite now is readying to want and to acquire the education he will need. Some of this he will get by returning to universities for graduate study or for mid-career updating; some he will get by participating -- reluctantly or vigorously -- in other organized enterprises; much of it he will get on his own initiative. Second, the substance conveyable by teaching seems destined to become much more fundamentally influential. I speak not of the inevitable replacement of the New Math by the Newer Math by the Newest Math and then return to the Old Math. I speak of having the methodologies and subject-matter to really convey through the teaching act such attributes as the power to think, the ability to

control and direct emotions, the disposition to get involved in life. These brave phrases have long been in the literature of teaching; researchers are beginning to add them to the lexicon. The moral for teacher education is this: room and means must be found for incorporation of revolutionary new definitions of what it means to teach. "Teaching" can no longer be planned for as if we know what it is and all we have to do is train somebody to follow the well-beaten pathways. Third, the education of teachers is going to be big business and poverty-stricken provisions by poverty-stricken institutions and school systems will no longer be competitive. I fully expect to see within my lifetime a dozen major corporations producing and selling teacher education nationwide at a profit and having a product which will compare favorably in technical excellence with their computers, their critical-path engineering services, or their television sets as commodities. Planners no longer need deal with peanut ideas and impoverished make-do. Fourth, external compulsions upon the individual teacher and upon

his employer to practice teacher education are growing apace. The Federal Government alone introduced in 1965 more incentives to the pursuit and acquisition of professional education by teachers than existed in total ten years ago, and most people think this is a mere preliminary shock-wave. Planners who disregard this new shape of "get equipped to do a professional job, come hell or high water" are out of touch with reality, but those who regard it risk the danger of sporadic improvisations without a theme. That is what planning is for -- to turn compulsions into opportunities and to make opportunities thematic.

4. No platform is complete without a plank putting somebody on the spot. Who does planning? In the shape of things to come, first and foremost the individual professional. We enter an era in which teacher education is improperly conceived as something somebody or some agency thrusts on somebody else. Teacher education in large part has to rest as an obligation upon an individual -- multiplied by a million --

Blured page

who chooses to pursue learning and its application all his life; it is he who pushes his own tray down an overwhelming cafeteria line or who decides to cook at home.

Traditionally, planning for teacher education has occurred in combines of persons assembled at one level or another of the control-stations for what transpires in the name of teacher education. Also traditionally, these persons "represent" one or another interest which has a stake in the composition and/or effectiveness of the means-ends strategy evolved, and in composite are therefore expected to "represent" all interests. Too often, the outcome is exactly what one would expect from the representational character of the combine -- a political tour de force, not planning for teacher education as that word "planning" is employed herein. We are too much worried, this speaker opines, about whether "the profession", should be represented, the "academicians" should be represented, the "educationists" should be represented, and so on. In effect, we may be assembling nine or

seventeen closed minds to open doors for venture and experimentation. The criterion of Thomas Jefferson is much better. In his "Bill for the More General Diffusion of Knowledge" he entrusted the awesome power of education to "...an overseer appointed annually by the Aldermen...eminent for his learning, integrity, and fidelity to the commonwealth...." Planners who have those attributes -- eminence in learning, in integrity, and in fidelity to the matter at hand -- are probably more to be desired than anybody's representatives.

A word is in order about the control-levels at which planning for teacher education should occur. There was a time when state-level planning was the proper first focus of attention. There were just too many little old ladies who did not want to cross the street or who were unable to do so under thier own power. Many of us who have been professionally engaged in teacher education for three decades or more find it difficult to relinquish primacy for state-level focus. In fact, we look still higher to national-level as the most

promising ally of quality and content control in teacher education. We are inclined to think that Doctor James B. Conant is dewy-eyed when he looks elsewhere for influential, powerful planning for the education of teachers. The little old ladies are still there, we fear. Yet, I think we are misjudging the future of things. It seems inescapable that the really effective planning for teacher education in the next decade must find its prime focus at local-level. This means the individual college and university, the individual school system or network of school systems, the individual business corporation, the individual regional laboratory created under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. Perhaps the new function of planning at state-level and national-level is to find ways to stimulate, inform and tool up planning at local levels. Uniformity may suffer in the process, but productivity may benefit.

5. And that thought leads to the final plank in a platform for planning. Planning is threatened with sterility if it is limited to

a single product. The great need in teacher education in the next ten years is greater, richer variety. So much needs to be found out, so much needs to be explored, so much needs the benefit of pilot runs, and so much needs to be enlivened by a sense of inventor's proprietorship. For years, it seems to this observer, we have been bedeviled with an unspoken notion that planning for teacher education is a search for the Holy Grail. Isn't it about time we relinquished to some future generation that search? There are some mighty useful ideas -- and that word is pluralistic -- at hand; the idea has yet to be found if it exists, and the best way to find it may be to exploit what we have and can bring to hand.

Address to a Section of the
Governor's Conference on Education,
State of Utah
December 1, 1965.

by

Laurence D. Haskew
Vice-Chancellor
The University of Texas

LDH:as
November 19, 1965